Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-21 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13-16, and 21 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 13-15, 17, 19 and 21 are sought to be amended. Claim 12 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

Fig. 21C and 21D are objected to for not being of sufficient quality to permit examination. Fig. 9 is objected to for lacking labels to the X and Y axes. Accordingly, Applicants submit corrected replacement drawings of Fig. 9, 21C, and 21D herewith to overcome these objections, and thus respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 is objected to for being a duplicate of claim 11. Accordingly, claim 12 is cancelled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 13 and 15 are objected to due to some informalities. Applicants have amended claims 13 and 15 herein to correct these informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dabell (U.S. Patent 6, 621,862). Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments, but, for the reasons set forth herein, respectfully traverse.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that Dabell teaches a method for adaptively equalizing a multi-gigabit analog information signal for a signal path as recited in claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, among other features, "performing an equalizing process on the analog samples". Support for this amendment is found at, for example, paragraph 0072 of the present specification. Dabell teaches to digitize the analog input signals before performing the equalization (Fig. 3; Col. 3, lines 37-39). Dabell does not, however, teach performing the equalization directly on the analog samples, as recited in claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 2 and 11 depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2 and 11 is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 was cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Rejection of claim 12 is thus rendered moot.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, the Examiner states that Dabell teaches a method for adaptively equalizing as recited in claims 13 and 14. Applicants have carefully considered the method of Dabell, but found no reference therein to, among other features, "equalizing time staggered portions" of a single or a plurality of multi-gigabit analog signals as recited in claims 13 and 14, respectively. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 14 are requested.

Regarding claim 15, the Examiner states that Dabell teaches a method for adaptively equalizing a plurality of multi-gigabit analog information signals as recited in claim 15. Applicants have carefully considered the method of Dabell, but found no reference therein to, among other features, "generating a clock signal for each of the multi-gigabit analog information signals from each of the respective multi-gigabit analog information signals". Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Regarding claim 16, the Examiner states that Dabell teaches a system for quantizing a multi-gigabit analog information signal as recited in claim 16. Claim 16 of the present invention recites, among other features, an equalizer that "minimizes inter-symbol interferences in samples". Dabell teaches an equalizer that keeps the bit error rate (BER) below a desired threshold, by measuring the BER using an error decoder and adjusting the equalization coefficients. Dabell does not, however, teach or suggest an equalizer that minimizes inter-symbol interference as recited in claim 16. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 17-19 depend directly or indirectly from claim 16 and are thus patentable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 16. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 17-19 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimomura (U.S. Patent 6, 404,525). Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments, but, for the reasons set forth herein, respectfully traverse.

The Examiner states that Shimomura teaches a system for routing and adaptively equalizing high data rate analog data signals as recited in claim 21. Shimomura is directed to a wavelength multiplexer not a receiver with an adaptive equalizer. Shimomura does not teach, among other features, an "interface board including a plurality of receivers coupled to said backplane signal paths, each said receiver including an adaptive equalizer " as recited in claim 21. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabell (U.S. Patent 6,621,862). Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments, but, for the reasons set forth herein, respectfully traverse.

Claim 3 depends indirectly from claim 1. Claim 3 is thus patentable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabell (U.S. Patent 6,621,862) in view of alleged admitted prior art. Applicants

have carefully considered the Examiner's comments, but, for the reasons set forth herein, respectfully traverse.

Claim 4 depends indirectly from claim 1. Claim 4 is thus patentable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 is requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimomura (U.S. Patent 6,404,525). Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments, but, for the reasons set forth herein, respectfully traverse.

The Examiner states that Shimomura teaches a system for routing and adaptively equalizing high data rate analog data signals as recited in claim 21. Shimomura is directed to a wavelength multiplexer not a receiver with an adaptive equalizer. As noted above, Shimomura does not teach, among other features, an "interface board including a plurality of receivers coupled to said backplane signal paths, each said receiver including an adaptive equalizer " as recited in claim 21. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Patrick E. Garrett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,987

Date: 12/28/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

326190_1.DOC